



State of Washington
Legislative Budget Committee

Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction Performance Audit

Appendices to Report 96-1

January 10, 1996

*Upon request, this document is available in alternative formats
for persons with disabilities.*

SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

Appendix 1

Scope

This mandated study will assess the performance of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) in meeting its constitutional and legislatively mandated duties.

*Objectives**

Describe the roles and responsibilities relative to other state public education agencies and other educational service entities.

Review how OSPI over time has utilized its resources to meet constitutional, state and federal mandates, and assess the efficiency of the OSPI's use of resources.

Examine the extent to which OSPI programs duplicate or overlap with other public agency's programs.

Compare the nature and cost of OSPI functions with functions provided by central education agencies in other states.

Determine the extent to which state education agency functions have been privatized or provided locally in other states.

Compare Washington State's receipt of federal education funds with other states and review OSPI's role in securing and disbursing those funds.

Review selected OSPI regulations, and the rule making process.

Determine the extent to which OSPI has developed program objectives in response to the mandate of the Performance Based Government Act of 1993, and assess OSPI's performance and effectiveness against the program objectives, and against their constitutional and legislatively mandated mission.

Assess the extent to which OSPI's customers are satisfied with its services, and whether service to OSPI customers could be improved.

Identify areas for further legislative study.

* To the extent that data and criteria are available to address these objectives.

AGENCY RESPONSES

Appendix 2

- **Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction**
- **State Board of Education**

blank



SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

JUDITH A. BILLINGS

OLD CAPITOL BUILDING • PO BOX 47200 • OLYMPIA WA 98504-7200

December 20, 1995

The Honorable Al Bauer, Chair
Legislative Budget Committee
PO BOX 40910
Olympia, WA 98504-0910

RECEIVED
DEC 20 1995
LEGISLATIVE
BUDGET COMMITTEE

Dear Senator Bauer:

RE: Performance Audit—Preliminary Report

We have received the performance audit preliminary report pertaining to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction as prepared by staff of the Legislative Budget Committee (LBC). Attached is the agency response to staff recommendations which I understand will be included in the final report.

In responding, I want to express to you and members of the LBC our appreciation for the manner in which the audit was conducted. While audits and external reviews can at times be arduous or unsettling for those under the microscope, LBC staff were professional in every way—clear in purpose, thorough, and courteous as they interacted with staff.

The resulting report, I believe, is comprehensive and, in most cases, well stated. You will note we either concur or partially concur with all recommendations.

Again, my appreciation to LBC staff for the service they provided to our agency and the state. I look forward to discussing with you in January the final report and what actions our agency is prepared to take as a result of it.

Thank you for your interest in education.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Judith".

Judith A. Billings
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

JAB:jh
Enclosure

- Recommendation 1** **Concur.** We will review mission and duties of the agency and seek recommendations for improvements with key customers. We will review roles and responsibilities on boards and commissions and seek to reduce or eliminate participation if deemed unnecessary. However, in many cases, membership is critical to the ability of other organizations (as well as OSPI) to conduct their business and coordinate plans so as to reduce duplication and improve efficiencies.
- Recommendation 2** **Concur.** We are currently considering converting at least one position into Washington Management Service (WMS) and will consider converting other professional staff into the WMS where appropriate.
- Recommendation 3** **Concur.** Over the past two biennia, due to mandated cuts imposed on the agency, we deliberately reduced upper management positions and reorganized operational units. With federal budget cuts looming, we expect to re-assess agency operations and use of personnel once the magnitude of cuts is known. At that time, we will carefully consider the LBC staff recommendation.
- Recommendation 4** **Partially concur.** Currently, the deputy superintendent must approve all discretionary expenditures for equipment, out-of-state travel, and personal service contracts, and our fiscal office carefully tracks all such expenditures. Thus, spending is very centralized and controlled. We have not used a centralized priority-setting process, believing that resource allocation for the above items can best be determined by line managers who know their programs and needs. Criteria and guidelines governing discretionary purchasing will be reviewed and modified to improve efficiencies.
- Recommendation 5** **Concur.** Most of the recommendations are currently underway and have been for some time. We will pursue these issues as resources permit.



Recommendation 6	Concur. We will pursue these issues as time and resources permit.
Recommendation 7	Concur. Most of the recommendations are currently underway and have been for some time. Some are already in place. We will pursue these issues as resources permit.
Recommendation 8	Concur.
Recommendation 9	(State Board Response)
Recommendation 10	Concur. The writing of these is currently underway.
Recommendation 11	Concur.
Recommendation 12	Concur. The current system is ten years old and would benefit from review.



blank



WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

OLD CAPITOL BUILDING • PO BOX 47206 • OLYMPIA WASHINGTON 98504-7206

Providing leadership, support, and advocacy so that each student achieves success in school and life

December 21, 1995

Cheryle A. Broom
Legislative Auditor
Legislative Budget Committee
P.O. Box 40910
Olympia, Washington 98504-0910

DEC 21 1995
LEGISLATIVE
BUDGET COMMITTEE

Dear Ms. Broom:

Thank you for the invitation to respond to the preliminary performance audit report of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and specifically those recommendations which directly or indirectly relate to the State Board of Education.

<u>REC. #</u>	<u>AGENCY POSITION</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
7e	Concur.	We will work with the State Superintendent's Office to pursue this issue as resources permit.
8	Concur.	We will work with the State Superintendent toward improving existing processes for informing the ESDs of changes in procedures, forms or requirements for professional certification.
9	Concur.	
11	Concur.	

Again, on behalf of Mr. Gary Gainer, President of the State Board of Education, I appreciate the opportunity to share the Board's perspective and thoughts.

Sincerely,

Larry Davis, Executive Director
State Board of Education

Gary Gainer, President • Candy Cox, Vice President • Willard Bartles, Past President • Judith Bullocks, Chief Executive Officer
Kathleen Anderson • Eugene Malsoska • Roberta "Bobbie" May • Harry Petersen • Mary Schwarzeleger • Neal Supplee • Joan Thompson

Larry Davis, Executive Director • (360) 353-6715 • TDD (360) 664-3631 • FAX (360) 386-2357

blank

Appendix Three

		<i>Total</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Tot. Student</i>	<i>Fed. Funds</i>	<i>Fed. Revenues as</i>
<i>Rank</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Federal Revenues</i>	<i>1992 Budget</i>	<i>Membership</i>	<i>per Student</i>	<i>% of total</i>
1	AK	128,612,346	1,120,969,863	118,680	\$ 1,084	11.5%
2	DC	66,508,000	711,172,000	80,618	\$ 825	9.4%
3	MS	289,301,788	1,700,420,095	504,127	\$ 574	17.0%
4	NM	169,616,149	1,368,013,169	308,667	\$ 550	12.4%
5	ND	59,909,383	531,596,272	118,376	\$ 506	11.3%
6	SD	61,985,547	552,887,349	131,576	\$ 471	11.2%
7	MT	72,483,217	636,432,844	155,779	\$ 465	11.4%
8	KY	296,572,584	2,939,351,294	646,024	\$ 459	10.1%
9	LA	363,957,804	3,377,064,315	794,128	\$ 458	10.8%
10	NY	1,210,480,812	21,518,045,381	2,643,993	\$ 458	5.6%
11	DE	46,143,858	608,014,608	102,196	\$ 452	7.6%
12	AR	197,914,625	1,824,621,361	438,518	\$ 451	10.8%
13	AL	322,576,345	2,823,340,272	722,004	\$ 447	11.4%
14	AZ	284,615,317	3,076,810,004	656,980	\$ 433	9.3%
15	HI	75,310,156	1,000,848,030	174,747	\$ 431	7.5%
16	SC	262,739,523	2,883,361,945	627,470	\$ 419	9.1%
17	FL	788,419,601	10,810,521,925	1,932,131	\$ 408	7.3%
18	WV	129,762,839	1,715,554,090	320,249	\$ 405	7.6%
19	CA	2,027,474,127	26,868,216,313	5,107,145	\$ 397	7.5%
20	NJ	436,023,932	10,523,001,657	1,109,796	\$ 393	4.1%
21	PA	664,767,038	11,557,238,101	1,692,797	\$ 393	5.8%
22	TN	324,252,125	3,093,742,894	833,651	\$ 389	10.5%
23	RI	53,653,363	896,056,333	142,144	\$ 377	6.0%
24	MI	599,076,188	9,639,801,402	1,593,561	\$ 376	6.2%
25	OR	183,784,141	2,823,168,707	498,614	\$ 369	6.5%
26	IL	680,350,888	9,959,661,307	1,848,166	\$ 368	6.8%
27	MA	296,701,933	5,621,629,239	846,155	\$ 351	5.3%
28	GA	409,741,267	5,332,427,984	1,177,569	\$ 348	7.7%
29	ME	73,875,735	1,246,797,997	216,400	\$ 341	5.9%
30	VT	32,761,416	645,751,356	97,137	\$ 337	5.1%
31	NE	93,705,447	1,493,935,431	279,552	\$ 335	6.3%
32	NC	364,253,271	5,067,118,187	1,097,598	\$ 332	7.2%
33	WA	288,382,114	5,086,068,236	869,327	\$ 332	5.7%
34	MD	238,573,098	4,692,155,444	736,238	\$ 324	5.1%
35	TX	1,120,399,624	16,822,422,579	3,464,371	\$ 323	6.7%
36	OH	571,415,683	9,725,613,226	1,783,767	\$ 320	5.9%
37	VA	322,155,967	5,560,450,903	1,016,204	\$ 317	5.8%
38	WY	31,762,119	550,788,786	102,074	\$ 311	5.8%
39	ID	69,859,389	861,949,178	225,680	\$ 310	8.1%
40	MO	258,032,192	4,032,605,190	842,965	\$ 306	6.4%
41	IN	272,354,794	5,121,135,565	956,988	\$ 285	5.3%
42	KS	123,564,010	2,141,718,593	445,390	\$ 277	5.8%
43	IA	132,717,808	2,485,618,970	491,363	\$ 270	5.3%
44	WI	216,430,109	4,966,199,773	814,671	\$ 266	4.4%
45	CT	126,225,135	3,891,217,045	481,050	\$ 262	3.2%
46	MN	200,852,808	4,382,879,851	773,571	\$ 260	4.6%
47	CO	152,090,207	3,057,130,293	593,030	\$ 256	5.0%
48	UT	106,068,511	1,527,561,328	456,430	\$ 232	6.9%
49	NV	46,957,459	1,122,853,151	211,810	\$ 222	4.2%
50	OK					

Source: OSPI and census data.

Federal Revenue Per Student (1) Selected States

Census Data	Student Population	Compensatory Ed. (Title I)	School Improvement	Impact Aid	Indian Education	Post Secondary Education	Ed. for the Handicapped	Sp. Ed. Rehab Svcs.	Vocational Education	Bilingual	Other	Total
Arizona \$/student % of total	656,980 \$ \$	98,844 \$ 150 34%	18,621 \$ 28 6%	71,043 \$ 108 25%	8,777 \$ 13 3%	1,817 \$ 3 1%	34,826 \$ 53 12%	28,618 \$ 44 10%	19,511 \$ 30 7%	3,621 \$ 6 1%	2,380 \$ 4 1%	\$ 288,058 \$ 438 100%
California \$/student % of total	5,107,145 \$ \$	776,718 \$ 152 46%	148,272 \$ 29 9%	70,894 \$ 14 4%	5,422 \$ 1 0%	16,045 \$ 3 1%	277,610 \$ 54 16%	178,124 \$ 35 11%	132,232 \$ 26 8%	72,157 \$ 14 4%	15,212 \$ 3 1%	\$1,692,686 \$ 331 100%
Oregon \$/student % of total	498,614 \$ \$	68,340 \$ 137 42%	14,304 \$ 29 9%	3,933 \$ 8 2%	1,489 \$ 3 1%	1,394 \$ 3 1%	32,982 \$ 66 20%	24,948 \$ 50 15%	13,996 \$ 28 9%	1,102 \$ 2 1%	1,744 \$ 3 1%	\$ 164,232 \$ 329 100%
Montana \$/student % of total	155,779 \$ \$	24,976 \$ 160 30%	6,728 \$ 43 8%	23,823 \$ 153 29%	2,487 \$ 16 3%	329 \$ 2 0%	10,284 \$ 66 12%	8,449 \$ 54 10%	5,429 \$ 35 6%	35 \$ 0 0%	1,023 \$ 7 1%	\$ 83,563 \$ 536 100%
Alaska \$/student % of total	118,680 \$ \$	23,766 \$ 200 16%	6,687 \$ 56 5%	85,999 \$ 725 58%	8,179 \$ 69 6%	209 \$ 2 0%	9,670 \$ 81 7%	7,312 \$ 62 5%	4,905 \$ 41 3%	- \$ 0 0%	719 \$ 6 0%	\$ 147,446 \$ 1,242 100%
Wash. \$/student % of total	869,327 \$ \$	98,069 \$ 113 36%	23,952 \$ 28 9%	28,841 \$ 33 11%	3,329 \$ 4 1%	2,449 \$ 3 1%	51,895 \$ 60 19%	35,989 \$ 41 13%	21,900 \$ 25 8%	3,127 \$ 4 1%	3,102 \$ 4 1%	\$ 272,653 \$ 314 100%

[1] Federal revenues based on US census information for 1994. Student population based on 1992 data from OSPI.

CONGRESSIONAL EDUCATION FUNDING PROPOSALS

Appendix Four

Impact to Washington State

Congressional proposals:

As of November 14, 1995, Congress is debating the future of education funding. Many of their proposals will reduce funding for education funding while other proposals include consolidation or block granting to the states of federal education programs. In general, under the House and Senate proposals, federal education funding to OSPI may be reduced 14% and 6.3% respectively. Most programs are being reduced by 18%. Highlights of the Congressional proposals include elimination of Goals 2000 and significant reductions in bilingual education and safe and drug free schools. The following table summarizes the general cuts or block grant proposals for each of the major OSPI federally funded areas.

Estimated Impact of Federal Budget Reductions for Education Programs

<i>Program</i>	<i>Percentage Reduction</i>		<i>OSPI Federal Rev.</i>	<i>Dollar Reduction</i>	
	<i>House</i>	<i>Senate</i>		<i>House</i>	<i>Senate</i>
Regular Education					
Impact Aid	-21.50%	-7.00%	28,819,471	-6,187,687	-2,017,363
Other programs	-18.00%	-18.00%	4,011,016	-721,983	-721,983
Handicapped Education	-5.00%	3.00%	37,401,033	-1,870,052	1,122,031
Vocational Education [1]	-31.00%	-9.00%	6,982,996	-2,164,729	-628,470
Compensatory Education					
Remedial Title 1	-17.00%	-10.00%	90,572,825	-15,397,380	-9,057,282
Bilingual	-73.00%	-21.50%	2,386,202	-1,741,927	-513,033
Other	-18.00%	-18.00%	11,621,230	-2,091,821	-2,091,821
Other Education					
Block Grant	-25.00%	-8.10%	7,490,289	-1,872,572	-606,713
Math Science	-25.00%	-8.10%	1,770,038	-442,510	-143,373
Safe and Drug Free Schools	-59.00%	-57.00%	3,262,064	-1,924,618	-1,859,376
Other	-18.00%	-18.00%	9,489,671	-1,708,141	-1,708,141
Non Education Services	-18.00%	-18.00%	538,380	-96,908	-96,908
Child Nutrition Services[2]	-5.30%	0.00%	85,607,833	-4,502,972	-
Goals 2000	-100.00%	-17.10%	12,500,000	-12,500,000	-2,137,500
Total [3]	-14.00%	-6.30%	289,953,048	-40,723,300	-18,322,432

[1] Based upon H.R. 1617 and S. 143

[2] Based upon H.R. 4 and S. 1120

[3] All reductions, except those specifically noted, are based upon H.R. 2127

FTE COMPARISON: TEXAS VS. WASHINGTON EDUCATION AGENCIES

Appendix Five

***Texas Education Agency vs. Washington OSPI
Based on Texas Education Agency Organization Structure***

Note: There are considerable differences between Washington and Texas in terms of the number of school districts and pupil enrollment.

	<u>Texas</u>	<u>Washington</u>
Number of School Districts	1,051	296
Enrollment (FY 1992)	3,464,371	869,327

	<i>Texas</i>	<i>WA</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Commissioner of Education- Commissioner's Office, Budget, Accounting, Human Services	170	40	
Field Services	16		
Curriculum & Assessment	99	32	
Professional Development	109	18	Texas has teacher competency testing
Programs and Instruction	283	84	
Accountability-Accreditation & Investigations	99	6	
School Support Services	377	85	Appears to include work done by the state auditor in WA Texas purchases textbooks for districts WA has contracted data processing
Grand Total	1,152	265	

Source: Texas Comptroller's 1993 Audit of the Texas Education Agency. The alignment of Washington staff into the organization structure of Texas is illustrative.

